



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/636,392	08/09/2000	David N. Still	50325-0114	5542

29989 7590 02/06/2004

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
1600 WILLOW STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

HALIM, SAHERA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/636,392

Applicant(s)

STILL ET AL.

Examiner

Sahera Halim

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,470,389(hereinafter Chung) in view of Holden et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,620 (hereinafter Holden).

4. Regarding claim 1, Chung teaches a method of communicating information in a network that includes a host that originates a request (Fig. 4, client 52 originates a request), a first server that serves a response to the request (server 1), and a second server that cooperates with the first server to respond to the request (server 2 and col.5, lines 47- 62), the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

receiving a first request for a service from the host, which request includes a network address of the host (Fig. 4, lines 12 col. 8, line 49); and

communicating a second service request to the second server based on the first service request and including the host network address only when a first network address of the first

Art Unit: 2157

server is identical to a second network address of the second server (col. 3, lines 65 – col. 4, line 63; the address of two servers can be identical when the two servers are in a cluster).

Although the system disclosed by Chung shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to teach that the communication in the network is secure. Nonetheless, secure communication is old and well known in the art as evidenced by Holden. Holden discloses a method of securely communicating information in a network (abstract). Given the teachings of Chung and Holden, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Chung by including security features in order to prevent the system from any intrusions.

5. Regarding claim 2, Chung and Holden do not disclose the request of the host comprises a key value comprising an originating host Internet Protocol (IP) address and a random value. However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because it enhances the security of the system.

6. Regarding claim 3, Chung discloses the step of communicating a second service request comprises the step of accepting the host request only when an IP address of the second server is the same as an IP address of the first server (col. 3, lines 65 – col. 4, line 63; the address of two servers can be identical when the two servers are in a cluster).

Art Unit: 2157

7. Reference to claim 4, Chung teaches the host is a Web browser and wherein the host request comprises a Universal Resource Locator (URL) that includes an IP address of the host (col. 5, lines 55 – 61).

8. As to claim 5, Chung and Holden do not explicitly teach the host request comprises an HTML POST form that includes an IP address of the host. However, these limitations are old and well known in the art as evidenced by the background description of Chung. It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these limitations in order to enable communication between the servers and the client.

9. Claims 6-25 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1-5. Although some claims of 6-25 are not identical to claims 1-5, they do not further teach or differ over the limitations recited in claims 1-5.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,081,829 Sidana

U.S. Pat. No. 5,872, 847 to Boyle et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,094,485 to Weinstein et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,872,915 to Dykes et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,946,399 to Kitaj et al.

Art Unit: 2157

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sahera Halim whose telephone number is (703) 305-8054. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Sahera Halim
Patent Examiner
AU : 2157

January 31, 2004


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100